



MEETING MINUTES – DEL MEDIO PARK NEIGHBORHOOD MTG. #1

Meeting Date / Time: Tuesday February 22, 2010; 7:30 PM. Community School of Music & Art

Attendees: Anne Marie Starr – Senior Project Manager, City of Mountain View Public Works Dept.
Bob Kagiya – Principal Civil Engineer, City of Mountain View Public Works Dept.
Dave Muela – Community Services Director, City of Mountain View Community Services Dept.
Bruce Hurlburt – Parks and Open Space Manager, City of Mountain View Community Services Dept.
Steve Sutherland – Principal, SSA Landscape Architects, Inc.
Scott Reeves – Senior Project Manager, SSA Landscape Architects, Inc.
Community Attendees: 12

Contained herein is a summary of the items discussed during the neighborhood meeting for the Del Medio Park in the City of Mountain View. These notes were prepared from the discussions and conclusions of the meeting.

I. Introductions:

- a. Welcome
 - i. Ms. Starr welcomed the community members in attendance, introduced the project team and passed around a sign in sheet.
 - ii. Ms. Starr expressed excitement to get the wheels turning on the project
- b. Meeting Process
 - i. The purpose of the neighborhood meeting was to provide background on the project and acquire feedback from nearby residents on what features they would like to see on the park site
 - ii. City and Consultant roles – to familiarize the community with the park design process

II. Project Introduction:

- a. Park Location - Mr. Muela identified the park site on Del Medio Avenue between Miller Avenue and California Street in the City of Mountain View
- b. Type of Park – The proposed park was identified as a mini-park site
 - i. Several acceptable activities at a park of this size were identified
 - 1. Gathering area
 - 2. Benches/ Seating
 - 3. Informal turf areas
 - 4. Play structures
 - ii. Several unacceptable activities at a park of this size were identified
 - 1. Restroom facilities
 - 2. BBQ equipment
 - 3. Formal/ dedicated turf areas for organized sports
 - iii. Neighboring Parks and Facilities along with their programmed activities were identified
- c. History of the park
 - i. City identified the need for a mini-park facility to service the Del Medio neighborhood through the Parks and Open Space Plan.

- ii. City explored several options to acquire an appropriate site, including reaching out to the public to help them find available lots.
- iii. The mini-park land was purchased for upwards of \$2 million – the exact number was unavailable during the presentation but could be obtained by contacting the City.

III. **Inventory & Analysis:**

- a. Existing conditions – Presented by SSA as a means of familiarizing the community with the site
 - i. Site boundary
 - ii. Adjacent properties were identified as an apartment complex north of the site, townhomes south of the site, and single family homes behind the site
 - iii. Existing vegetation to remain – An arborist report identified the exiting Pepper Tree as meeting “Heritage” criteria and has recommended it be preserved along with one Loquat and two Walnut Trees
 - iv. Offsite vegetation – The arborist report has also identified two Redwood Trees offsite that frame the back of the site and should be taken into consideration
 - v. Power Point tour of site
- b. Opportunities and Constraints
 - i. Park Size - .35 acre
 - ii. Existing vegetation – Arborist recommendations to be considered/ incorporated in park design
 - iii. Proximity to adjacent properties should be taken into account for visual and sound screening purposes
 - iv. Street traffic on Del Medio Avenue identified as moderate
 - v. Water conservation measures should be incorporated into the design

IV. **Similar Mini-Parks Comparison/ Appropriate Program:**

- a. Similar mini-parks were presented to give the public an idea of the typical size and program for a mini park
 - i. Gemello Park
 - ii. Thaddeus Park
 - iii. Mercy-Bush Park
- b. The following program elements were presented as a means to summarize what uses are appropriate for a park of this size
 - i. Children’s Play Equipment
 - 1. Tot Lot (Ages 2-5)
 - 2. Adventure Play (Ages 5- 12)
 - 3. Independent Play (Stand Alone Units)
 - 4. Rock Climbing
 - 5. Swing Set
 - 6. Sand Play with Water
 - ii. Picnic Area
 - 1. Gathering area
 - 2. Benches/ Seating
 - 3. Drinking Fountain
 - 4. Bike Rack

- iii. Passive recreation
 - 1. Trails - strolling
 - 2. Informal picnicking
 - 3. Informal gathering/ seating
 - 4. Grass areas
 - 5. Shade Trees
- c. The question was asked to compare the size of Del Medio Park to Mercy-Bush Park. Mercy Bush identified as much larger at nearly one acre.

V. Conceptual Ideas Presentation and Discussion:

- a. Three concepts were provided as a starting point for community to start thinking about what they want to see in their park, their likes and dislikes, and to understand the spatial restrictions of the site.
 - i. Concept A
 - 1. Two entrances
 - 2. Covered (trellis) picnic area
 - 3. Trail for access to native grass area
 - 4. Buffer planting around perimeter
 - 5. One Medium sized play area
 - 6. One Medium sized flat turf area
 - ii. Concept B
 - 1. One central entrance, dividing play areas into age specific areas
 - 2. Large formal picnic area with shade from trees
 - 3. Seat wall enclosing two small sized play areas
 - 4. Focal point with specimen tree
 - 5. Two grassy mound areas
 - 6. Raised planters with ornamental plantings
 - 7. Informal access to native planting area
 - 8. Buffer planting around perimeter
 - iii. Concept C
 - 1. Two entrances
 - 2. One larger play area
 - 3. Two smaller picnic areas
 - 4. Large flat turf area
 - 5. Buffer planting around perimeter
- b. Informal Discussion
 - i. Concept A
 - 1. Pros expressed by attendees- Easy access to native plantings area
 - 2. Cons expressed by attendees - Two entrances encourage children to run a loop on sidewalk between access points
 - ii. Concept B
 - 1. Pros expressed by attendees - One entrance is more secure for small children
 - 2. Cons expressed by attendees - One entrance divides turf area in two
 - 3. No attendees expressed that this was a preferred concept.
 - iii. Concept C
 - 1. Pros expressed by attendees - Two picnic areas suits neighborhood needs best; One larger turf area is more practical than two smaller areas

2. Cons expressed by attendees - No easy access to native plantings area; Two entrances encourage children to run a loop on sidewalk between access points
 3. This concept was preferred because of access points, one continuous grass area, and ample amount of natural area.
- c. Common Themes
- i. Water conservation has been identified by the city as an important consideration of the park design and has been incorporated into all three concepts via a native plantings area
 - ii. Buffer planting must be incorporated into the design of the park to provide neighbors with privacy from park goers and vice versa
 - iii. Picnic/ Gathering space is incorporated into all three concepts
 - iv. Play area is also incorporated into all three concepts

VI. Community Input Activities:

- a. Community members in attendance each received a sum of “money” and were prompted to spend it on play equipment and site features they would like to see in the park design; *see results at the end of these notes.*
- b. Questionnaire – Provided to attendees for feedback; *see results at the end of these notes.*

VII. Summary Discussion:

- a. Public Meetings
 - i. Next meeting tentatively set for early April: design refinement / feedback
 1. Present results of questionnaire and buy your furnishings activities from previous meeting
 2. Present a refined park concept which represents a consensus from this meeting for comments
 - ii. PRC Meeting– Formal hearing with opportunity to view final park design, provide feedback
- b. Wrap Up
 - i. City expressed enthusiasm and encouraged everyone to stay involved

VIII. Clarifications / Questions / Project Specific Information

- a. The city does not promote lighting within mini-park sites to discourage extended stays past park hours. Parks hours are sunrise to one half hour past sunset.
- b. The city encourages landscaping or fencing as safe park enclosures, but does not encourage the use of gates.
- c. Neighborhood demographics includes elders, singles and small families
- d. Drinking Fountains are always provided on mini-park sites
- e. Demolition – Site will most likely be a part of Mt. View Fire Department exercise prior to demolition, which is slated to occur within the next couple of months
- f. Funding has been secured through the construction document phase which will provide the city with a better understanding of construction cost.
- g. Attendee requested the city explore funding benches and tables through Eagle Scout projects. City responded that this is available through existing park renovations but not new park construction.

IX. Results

a. Questionnaires were distributed and had several preferential questions on it, as well as opportunity for open comment.

i. Attendee Preferences

Questionnaire	Yes	No	% Desired
Nature Area	9	0	100%
Grass Area	9	1	90%
Walking Trail	9	1	90%
Shaded Picnic Area	8	1	88%
Tot Lot (2 - 5)	5	2	71%
Adventure Play (5 - 12)	6	3	67%
Favorite Concept	A	B	C
	3	1	7

ii. Individual Attendee Comments from the Questionnaire

1. Combination of concepts A and B desired. Mostly A for use of the whole areas.
2. Model park with climbing apparatus for ages 5-10 – not babies. Swings, hanging bars, traditional play structure, benches with back (for seniors) desired.
3. Par-course fitness equipment desired.
4. Water and Sand Play is wonderful! A play area that is less predefined gives more room for imagination. Thank you.
5. ½ Basketball Court desired.
6. ½ Basketball Court desired.
7. Monkey Bars desired. No mounds – Keep it flat.
8. Water play, benches, street lights, gate desired.
9. Provide enough street lights, benches and a gate at the entrance.
10. No paved trail on far back side would be good. I'd prefer one entrance concept.

b. Buy your park furnishings

Buy Your Park Furnishings	Cost	Bought	Ratio	Ranking
Picnic Table	\$2	\$51	25.5	1
Fitness Equipment	\$5	\$60	12	2
Game Table	\$3	\$21	7	3
Bench w/ Backrest	\$2	\$13	6.5	4
Traditional Play Structure	\$15	\$95	6.33	5
Independent Play	\$5	\$25	5	6
Swing Set	\$5	\$7	1.4	7
Tot Lot Structure (2 - 5)	\$10	\$10	1	8
Sand Box	\$5	\$5	1	8
New Age Play Structure	\$15	\$15	1	8
Seat Wall	\$5	\$5	1	8
Small Park Table	\$3	\$0	0	Last
Theme Play Structure	\$20	\$0	0	Last
Bench w/o Backrest	\$1	\$0	0	Last